

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/766,478	01/29/2004	Helmut Fitz	2004_0121A	3722
513	7590 12/29/2005		EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W.			TRAN, HANH VAN	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3637	· · ·

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/766,478	FITZ, HELMUT				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Hanh V. Tran	3637				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
Period for Reply	V 10 057 TO 5VDIDE - MONTH					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 J	anuary 2004.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-10 and 15-25 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 11-14 and 26 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	e: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Settion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/29/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					
	ction Summary Pa	art of Paper No./Mail Date 12272005				

Art Unit: 3637

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is the First Office Action on the Merits from the examiner in charge of this application.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

- 3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it includes legal phraseology, such as "comprising". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
- 4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Drawings

5. The drawings are objected to because figure 2 is missing. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if

Art Unit: 3637

only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 3637

8. Claims 1-3, 15-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2,169,492 to Bladen in view of USP 4,433,885 to Baker.

Bladen discloses a drawer comprising all the elements recited in the above listed claims including two drawer frame members, a rear wall, a drawer bottom and a front facing panel 25 being angled inwardly, the rear wall comprising two panels at right angle to each other, such as shown in Fig 2; wherein the drawer can be readily manufactured by a plurality of parts. The differences being that Bladen does not clearly disclose the facing panel being formed by at least two separate panels which are adjustably connected together, holding members coupled to spring-loaded arresting members.

Baker discloses the idea of providing a drawer with a front facing panel comprising at least two separate panels 22a-b which are adjustably connected together for the purpose of providing a knock-down front facing panel with adjustability for manufacturing tolerances, and holding members coupled to spring-loaded arresting members so as to maintain the shaft in a desired rotary position, such as shown in Figs 2-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the structure of Bladen by providing the facing panel being formed by at least two separate panels which are adjustably connected together for the purpose of providing a knock-down front facing panel with adjustability for manufacturing tolerances, and holding members coupled to spring-loaded arresting members so as to maintain the shaft in a desired rotary position, as taught by Baker, since both teach alternate conventional corner drawer structure, used for the same intended purpose, thereby providing structure as claimed.

Art Unit: 3637

9. Claims 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladen, as modified, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of USP 4,090,753 to Rock et al.

Bladen, as modified, discloses all the elements as discussed above except for the panels being adjustable in the horizontal and vertical directions relative to each other by at least one fitment.

Rock et al teaches the idea of connecting two members of a drawer by providing two panels 4,5 being adjustably connected together in the horizontal and vertical directions relative to each other by at least one fitment in order to overcome manufacturing tolerances. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the structure of Bladen, as modified, by providing structures to the panels of the front facing panel such that the panels being adjustably connected together in the horizontal and vertical directions relative to each other by at least one fitment in order to overcome manufacturing tolerances, as taught by Rock et al, since both teach alternate conventional connecting means for members of a drawer, thereby providing structure as claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 11-14, and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3637

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Koons, Banicevic et al, Akers, Swallow, Dreier, Albiez, Hallgren, Crownhart, Tassell, Humphrey, Pratt, Yoshida et al, and Kneile all show structures similar to various elements of applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-6868. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, and alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571) 272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HVT

December 27, 2005

Hanh V. Tran

allen

Art Unit 3637